		STATES DISTRICT COL
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Washington, DC 20044 Reply to Pla	Division Judge Maria-Elena James S' Motion For Leave to File Defendants' aintiff's response to OSC is GRANTED.
10 11	Facsimile: (202) 305-1890 E-mail: Linda.Cheng@usdoj.gov	13/2017
12	Counsel for Defendants	
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
14	NORTHER DISTRIC	of or each order
15	BERNARDO MENDIA,	Case No. C 10-3910 (MEJ)
16171819	Plaintiff, v. JOHN M. GARCIA, ET AL.,	DEFENDANTS' OPPOSED MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DEFENDANTS' REPLY TO PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
20	Defendants.	Honorable Maria-Elena James
21		DATE: April 27, 2017 TIME: 10:00 AM
22		PLACE: Courtroom B, 15th Floor
23		
24	Defendants respectfully request leave to reply to Plaintiff's response to the Court's Order	
25	to Show Cause ("OSC"). See ECF Nos. 224, 234. Plaintiff has failed to comply with the Court's	
2627	multiple orders requiring him to attend his deposition on March 22, 2017, in San Francisco,	
28	Defendants' Opposed Motion for Leave to File Defendants' Reply to Plaintiff's Response to Order to Show Cause CASE NO. C 10-3910 MEJ	
	1	

California; a Court-ordered in-person meet-and-confer on March 23, 2017; and a hearing on his Motion to Stay Proceedings on March 23, 2017. ECF Nos. 230, 210, 220. Additionally, the OSC noted that Plaintiff has failed to comply with his Rule 26 obligations and the Court's March 9, 2017 Order because he has not provided Defendants with documents related to his damages. ECF Nos. 203, 213, 216; *see* ECF Nos. 194 ¶¶ 1-2, 203 ¶ 2; Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1)(A)(iii). The Court further stated that sanctions may include, but not limited to, monetary penalties, striking Plaintiff's request for damages, or dismissing his claims.

At the hearing on March 23, 2017, Defendants suggested that the Court consider limiting Plaintiff's damages at trial as a remedial measure for his noncompliance with Court orders. The Court declined to decide the issue at the time and indicated that Defendants would have an opportunity to respond to the OSC too.

After the Court granted Plaintiff's request for a 7-day extension, he filed his response to the OSC on April 6, 2017. ECF Nos. 229, 234. Defendants request leave to reply to Plaintiff's response so that we may address several issues. More specifically, a reply by Defendants is necessary to clarify their position regarding the propriety of sanctions and to address Plaintiff's arguments regarding his failure to comply with the rules and Court orders. Defendants contacted Plaintiff on April 10, 2017, for his position on this request for leave to file a reply, and he indicated that he opposed the motion.

Defendants hereby attach their reply to Plaintiff's response to the OSC as Exhibit 1.

//

Defendants' Opposed Motion for Leave to File Defendants' Reply to Plaintiff's Response to Order to Show Cause CASE NO. C 10-3910 MEJ

1	DATED: April 13, 2017	Respectfully submitted by,
2		CHAD A. READLER Acting Assistant Attorney General
3		•
4		DAVID M. MCCONNELL Director, Office of Immigration Litigation Civil Division
5		
6 7		ERNESTO H. MOLINA, JR. Deputy Director
8		REGAN HILDEBRAND Senior Litigation Counsel
9		6
10		s/Linda Y. Cheng
11		LINDA Y. CHENG Trial Attorney
12		Civil Division, Office of Immigration Litigation
13		United States Department of Justice P.O. Box 878, Ben Franklin Station
14		Washington, DC 20044 Telephone: (202) 514-0500
15		E-mail: Linda.Cheng@usdoj.gov
16		Counsel for Defendant United States
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	Defendants' Opposed Motion for Leave to File Defendants' Reply to Plaintiff's Response to Order to Show Cause CASE NO. C 10-3910 MEJ	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on April 13, 2017, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of Court via the CM/ECF. I certify that all participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and that service on Plaintiff will be accomplished by the CM/ECF system.

Respectfully submitted by,

<u>s/ Linda Y. Cheng</u>LINDA Y. CHENGTrial Attorney